Ryan Waller

From: Ryan Waller

Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 6:24 PM

To: 'Adam Voigts'

Cc: Tom Gaffigan; Kelly Shaw; John Parker; Bob Kling; Shirley Clark; Greg Marchant; Joe

Gezel; Greta Southall

Subject:RE: Phone CallAttachments:Transition.pdf

Adam,

Thanks for the email and for taking my call.

First, as promised, I am sending this brief response to include the City Council and to also let those who were originally cc'd on your email know we spoke via phone.

Second, I am hoping to concisely memorialize what I shared so all are in the loop.

While many of the items referenced in the transition are administrative and operational in nature (I have reattached the email so all are aware of the items referenced in our emails), with IMU no longer wishing to provide those services for the non-utility functions of the City, this is a step in a different direction than what has been previously discussed among the respective governing bodies. Ultimately, these changes have policy implications (i.e. an impact on budget and headcount) for both entities. While I have been relaying information as I receive it from Tom, the Council has not been able to discuss these impacts or provide staff with direction. Nevertheless, as I shared, I plan on doing my best to relay the decisions and direction from IMU to the Council at its next meeting in order to seek the necessary direction (I had planned on sharing this with Tom once he returned from Nebraska).

Lastly, we did not discuss this next item, but I did feel it important to respond to the reference the "change in mission". My response was simply to what was stated in the second paragraph in the November 13th email all the way at the bottom. I hope this clears up any confusion on where this reference came from.

Thanks again for the time and the conversation. Also, I appreciate your understanding of my position's responsibility to the Council, especially on matters increasing headcount and budget impact.

Have a great evening.

Ryan

From: Adam Voigts <avoigts@grandview.edu> **Sent:** Wednesday, November 14, 2018 4:56 PM **To:** Ryan Waller <rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov>

Cc: Tom Gaffigan <tgaffigan@indianolaiowa.gov>; Kelly Shaw <kshaw@indianolaiowa.gov>

Subject: FW: Phone Call

Ryan,

I hope all is well with you. Tom shared your response to his email with me. I wondered if you could help me understand your statements in the email a little better. You indicate the Council would still like to meet with the reason being a

"change in mission shared by your earlier email is a change in policy that was established two years ago." I don't want to speak on behalf of the full IMU Board but am pretty sure that the IMU Board would not feel that IMU has changed their mission in any way other than being a whole lot further along on the FTTH project than we were two years ago. And I also don't know what policy you are referring to from two years ago. I think this was about the time you and Rob worked together to set up the Utility Services department so I'm not sure if this is what you are referring to or if there is some other policy.

Assuming you are referring to the Utility Services department, I don't know that anybody, even two years ago, intended for the set up then to be completely static with no intention to change. It seems reasonable to me that the new management team at IMU (mainly referring to Tom and Chris) are going to continually review their operations and suggest adjustments from time to time. And it seems reasonable that when they are going to be moving to a new building is a perfect opportunity to do such a review. Tom and Chris have done this review and have suggested changes in which organization performs certain operational tasks. I'm not understanding how this represents a change in mission or policy. I view it as good business practice that any organization should do (I do it in my work all the time).

I also wanted to remind you about the discussion that both the Council and IMU Board have had recently about the shared services agreement between the two organizations. If I recall correctly, City staff drafted the agreement and then had Council approve it. It then came to the IMU Board for review and we suggested a few changes to the document before we would approve. (There were probably a few more steps in this timeline but not important to my point.) The IMU Board felt the suggested changes were pretty minor but necessary. One of the suggested changes had to do with this exact situation. The agreement didn't really indicate how or when the allocation of duties and costs for the shared services would get reviewed and adjusted on some regular basis. The IMU Board felt this needed to be addressed in the agreement as it would impact the budgets of both organization. I don't believe this has been addressed as I don't believe the IMU Board has seen any suggested revisions to the agreement. (I can't recall for sure but think I might have even drafted some suggested language to add to the agreement.) Not having an agreement in place but feeling like they needed to start some discussion given the impending building move, I think Tom and Chris felt they needed to start the discussion with you and other City staff regarding some adjustments in duties within one of the shared services departments.

My impression is that the IMU Board feels the suggested adjustments are reasonable and the rationale for suggesting the change is sound. I personally don't feel there is any change in mission or policy. In fact, the suggested changes pull items out of IMU responsibility that are completely unrelated to the mission of IMU (but do fall within the mission of the City). My understanding is that the impact on budgets should be minimal at best. I assume this was discussed in your meeting with Tom last week but anticipate the City will pay less to IMU for the services provided by the Utility Services Department and the City can use this savings to perform the duties internally a different way. And IMU will receive less reimbursement from the City but the USRs will be more available to serve IMU customers, which is especially important and necessary now that we are launching fiber.

I hope you don't mind me sharing my thoughts through email and welcome either an email exchange or phone conversation to help me understand your thoughts on this issue.

And by the way, please don't take this as any sort of refusal to meet with the Council. The IMU Board is happy to meet with the Council as needed and I actually think periodic meetings can be valuable to both organizations. That said, I feel the IMU Board prefers these meetings stay out of operational items that management should be responsible for and instead should focus on policy or strategic issues. It very well could be that the Council just needs to hear from me, the rest of the IMU Board and Tom on our views related to the explanations I provided above.

Thanks, Adam

From: Tom Gaffigan [mailto:tgaffigan@indianolaiowa.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 5:42 PM

To: Adam Voigts

Subject: Fwd: Phone Call

Adam:

Please see Ryan's reply to my email regarding our boards decision about another Joint Meeting.

Seems the Council is still wishing to meet.

In Kearney until Friday.

Tom

Get Outlook for iOS

----- Forwarded message ------

From: "Ryan Waller" < rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov >

Date: Tue, Nov 13, 2018 at 11:05 AM -0600

Subject: RE: Phone Call

To: "Tom Gaffigan" < tgaffigan@indianolaiowa.gov>

Tom,

I just tried calling you back, but did not leave a voicemail. I spoke with the Council at the end of the special meeting last night and they do wish to have the joint meeting. The reason for this is that the change in mission shared by your earlier email is a change in policy that was established two years ago and has an impact on both the City's and IMU's budget moving forward. Does this make sense?

Safe travels and will talk with you soon.

Thanks.

Ryan

From: Tom Gaffigan

Sent: Tuesday, November 13, 2018 10:27 AM **To:** Ryan Waller < rwaller@indianolaiowa.gov>

Subject: Phone Call

Ryan:

I called your City Hall Telephone extension and left a voice mail message regarding the following.

At last night's IMU Board of Trustees Meeting I went over the IMU Admin Move Items e-mail I sent you on November 7th in preparation for our Team's meeting on Friday the 9th. It listed the Duties we presently perform on behalf of the City that we don't feel fall within the new mission of IMU; especially with the launch of our Telecommunications Utility. The list also included Other Topic Items such as equipment, P.O. Boxes, etc.

I reported to the IMU Board that our meeting on Friday was successful, but that you felt you didn't have the authority to commit to this change without the Council being involved, so we both agreed to arrange a Joint City/IMU Board Meeting in December.

Our Board feels the list of items and the move are not policy issues requiring a Joint City/IMU Meeting. The Board is comfortable with you and I working out the details and bringing the final product back for them to

approve. I also mentioned that at our Friday Team Meeting we discussed budget timing issues, and financial items, that need to be addressed, but that I didn't see that as being a major problem. As I mentioned in the meeting Friday; I would like to make the operational and financial changes right away, but am agreeable to move such changes to the new budget cycle if it makes things simpler. I really don't think this move and resulting changes will cause our respective organizations any major issues. I think the biggest challenge will be coordinating the move with the actual versus planned completion of the office remodeling project; and keeping our customers apprised of the move and new operational model.

As I mentioned in my voice mail; I am leaving for Kearney, Nebraska for a MEAN meeting and will not be back until Thursday night. I will see you Friday at the Road Show if you have any questions.

Sorry for the length of this e-mail. Hope it is clearer than the lengthy voice mail I left you. (3)

Thanks,

Tom Gaffigan **General Manager Indianola Municipal Utilities** 515-962-5301